

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/698,562	10/30/2003	Michael J. Neumann	10030590-1	1116
7590 09/06/2005			EXAMINER	
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			NGUYEN, TUYEN T	
Legal Department, DL429 Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 7599 Loveland, CO 80537-0599			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2832	
			DATE MAILED: 09/06/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(K	/
w	

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/698,562	NEUMANN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		TUYEN T. NGUYEN	2832			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2005.					
2a) <u></u> □	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This action is non-final.					
3)	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 4,5 and 12 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,3,6-11 and 13-17 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Other: O						

Application/Control Number: 10/698,562

Art Unit: 2832

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 6-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopfer [US 3,812,438] in view of Oldfield [US 6,509,821].

Hopfer discloses an inductor [figure 2] comprising:

- a coil form [58] having a conical portion with a tip;
- an integrated contact [58] disposed on the tip of the coil form; and
- an inductor coil [62] wound around the coil form and electrically coupled to the integrated contact.

Hopfer discloses the instant claimed invention except for the specific material of the coil form.

Oldfield discloses an inductor [figures 5A-5B] comprising:

- a poly-iron coil form [4] having a conical portion; and
- an inductor coil [2] disposed around the coil form.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use poly-iron for the coil form of Hopfer, as suggested by Oldfield, for the purpose of controlling the magnetic flux.

Regarding claim 3, Hopfer discloses the integrated contact comprises a plated tip portion of the coil form.

Regarding claim 10, Hopfer inherently discloses the integrated contact has a

radius not greater than 250 microns. The specific hemispherical radius of the integrated

contact would have been an obvious design consideration for the purpose of increasing

contact area.

Regarding claims 7, 11 and 16, it would have been obvious to solder the end of

the inductor coil to the integrated contact for the purpose of providing strength to the

electrical connection. The specific plating method for the contact would have been an

obvious design consideration for the purpose providing connection for the coil.

Regarding claims 6, 13 and 16, it would have been an obvious design

consideration to include groove in the plated tip integrated contact, instead on the coil

form, for the purpose of supporting end portion of the inductor coil and providing

mechanical strength to the connections.

Regarding claims 8 and 14, Hopfer inherently discloses the inductor coil wound

not more than one turn around the plated portion of the coil form.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-17 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-5 and 12 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to TUYEN T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-

272-1996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ELVIN ENAD can be reached on 571-272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TTN TW

Trugen T. Nguyen

Page 4